

## **Comments on Ecosystem Health**

- 96-111 The existing screens at the CVP and SWP intakes are inadequate. (F&G)
- 96-111 Operating criteria which reflect assurances for in-stream flow are needed. (F&G)
- 96-111 Relaxation of water quality standards and export limits must be tied to measured and sustained habitat benefits and fish population recovery. (F&G)
- 96-111 Windows for potential increases in exports need to be evaluated against impacts to all fish species. (F&G)
- 96-111 Accoustical barriers are an unproven technology. (F&G)
- 96-111 How will velocity through a screen at Hood be controled with a pumped diversion? (F&G)
- 96-111 Skeptical that reduced velocity of water crossing the Delta toward pumps will benefit salmon. (F&G)
- 96-111 Entrainment losses associated with diversions into chain of lakes. (F&G)
- 96-111 Is alternative "I" compatible with the concept of ecosystem management? (F&G)
- 96-111 Can an effective fish screen be constructed for a full isolated facility. (F&G)
- 96-63 Operating standards, new Delta standards and minimum flow standards for outflow and key locations in the Delta are needed. (F&G)
- 96-63 The Program should take credit for wildlife benefits in alternatives. (F&G)
- 96-63 More complete ecosystem actions are needed for the San Joaquin River System. (F&G)

X2 - delta dogma - not an excepted fact- as a fact and is well disputed - why are we stating it as fact and is upset about having it included as such.

Response - X2 is tate law, therefore assumed as existing standard. But will re-evaluate all in Phase II. P

system has been stressed as a whole - too much water being taken out of the system P

RCRC: Bay-Delta ecosystem includes headwaters of streams. Geographic scope should include whole ecosystem. Sierra Nevada ecosystem study should be folded into CALFED plan. SD

Will any alts save native fish populations? So CA and SD County appreciate environmental problems and will share cost, but need water transfer too. Address all factors that that contributed to degradation of system. Not just diversions. Ensure environmental plans will work or throwing good money after bad. SD

Look at impacts on habitat where ag land abuts habitat corridors. SD

Upper Sac River hard to dike because of changeable landscape. Beautiful wildlife, habitat. SAC

Friends of the River: strong support for meander belts. Why say improve SJ River, not restore? Armored river banks bad for fish. SAC

State Water Contractors: Historically land fallowing has unintended wildlife impacts. SAC

CUWA wants more habitat. SAC

League of Women Voters: Cost-benefit analysis should include environmental costs and benefits. Like F but prefer mimicking natural system. SAC

Focus on completing the loop -- providing flow for fish through the SF Bay. SAC

Flows and temperatures should be improved in upstream habitat. SAC

Will solution to fish diversion near Red Bluff be held up as we go forward with program? RB

Why isn't watershed management in all alts? RB

Sincere concern for watershed protection. RB

Forests are mismanaged. Water originates here. Not enough resources to do much-needed work in forests. Selling water could help fund forest improvements that would benefit water quality. RB

Arthur Feinstein

Q. Audubon - concern with preoccupation with everything but water - and habitat - but not talking about how much fresh water - including habitat restoration - where is it and during crit fish - there, fresh /brackish and endangered plants and too much emphasis on pulse flow and not

enough on where is the fresh water. O

We looking at the flows ,, not whole problem and we can improve the ecosystem by the we agree habitat is great, but if no water, no habitat O

Q. Is there actually any alternative that provides more water to the Delta/Estuary outflow, not just flushing, net above existing standards. O

Q. Why upper sac obtain water for environment - not range and the same amt for all - is a full range fair? O

A. Most aggressive alter f - has no facility hooked to it. there is storage hooked to many alternatives; partially dedicated to environ we haven't clearly showed what happens to environmental flows and we are in process of developing tables showing flows and critical flows in particular and more clear O

Water users needs - doesn't seem to be vision of ecosystem that CALLED is trying to achieve for the eco, but will it accomplish , species, and habitat , - range of alts that is capable of achieving the vision, - CALLED needs one O

Michael Jackson: Alts say nothing about Spring Run Salmon. Also nothing about Suisun Marsh. How much fresh water is needed to keep Suisun Marsh healthy? O

Arthur Feinstein: Want analysis of effects on Suisun Marsh of 65% diversion allowed under Accord. How much water is needed for Faralon Plume? What is chance of drying up river? O

Not clearly shown what is done for environmental flow. O

Concern with preoccupation with everything but water. Show amounts of water dedicated to ecosystem. O

No upper Sac River restoration unless you accept PC or major storage. O

Always been concerned about fish and pumping. Need improved habitat. O

Loss of upland habitat should be considered in construction of dams. O

EBMUD: Environmental document should acknowledge actions detrimental to species. O

BJ Miller: Fish screens impede water flow and fish get caught in screens. O

Does Alt F include SJ River restoration above Merced? BCH

Ecosystem improvement should be one selection criterion. Favor native species. BCH

Don't react to whatever type of fish shows up at the pumps. MET favors ecosystem mgmt not species-by-species approach. BCH

RCRC: Need full view of ecosystem, not ecosegment. BCH

Any SJ River benefits in Alt E? A: Purchase and development of 100,000 af for environmental use. BCH

Instead of restoration, say enhancement, since cannot turn it back to natural state. Do not want to mislead environmental community to believe that enhancement is restoration. BCH

If you add water, vegetation will re-establish itself. BCH

Need to account for cost of maintaining environmental enhancement. BCH

Selection criteria should include ecosystem improvement. BCH

Habitat restoration is good for water quality, especially upper Sac River and riparian restoration. BCH

Contra Costa Water District: Delta in our backyard, we want ecosystem improvement. BCH

Want ecosystem mgmt, not species mgmt. Do not want to be driven by ESA. BCH

If we're serious about watershed mgmt, we should start in source areas, not just Delta. BCH

CUWA wants system that will get us away from Environmental Protection Act. BCH

CA beaches starved for sediment. BCH

Support very high level of watershed and habitat. WG

Contra Costa Water District: Oppose large isolated facility that has potential to confuse fish. WG

Concerned with decline of aquatic habitat and waterside terrestrial habitat that is in advanced state of deterioration. We have done a lot to blend levee work with restoration or stopping the decline of habitats. WG

Valuable habitat in the Delta and on channel islands systematically eroding away. WG

Environmentalists want everything back the way the Indians had it. We like our habitat and are

tying to maintain. Horrible mgmt by Fish and Game, Fish and Wildlife, and NMFS. WG

How will you regulate recreational problems -- boat waves, etc. - that damage habitats? WG

All alternatives rely on reduced water use and are heavy on environmental restoration. WG

Where should meandering occur? We have property in north, Chico Creek is our northern boundary and have serious problems at Murphy's Slough entrance into Butte Basin -- hasn't been reinforced, and now we find out it hasn't been because you want meandering. No part of the Sac River has natural flows now so can't preserve natural flows. Environmentalists that have nothing at risk are jumping on this opportunity to describe this as a meander belt. Perhaps we should meander the river through Sutter's Forst and if that works then try it upstream. WG

Will you have Thalweg Feathering above Colusa? A: Maintain meander on north Sac River. Dredging will continue on south river. BK

How will program affect temperatures on Feather River. A: Rare to have lethal temps on Feather. Core actions incorporate all CVPIA. All alternatives deal with fish loss such as at Lold River Barrier. BK

Maricopa Storage District: Alts should address environmental problems. Cause of problems not clear. BK

95-4 Transport flows-no evidence to support idea that transport flows are needed to move smelt on SJR, remove Delta smelt from Ecosystem Quality Problem statements. (L. Renne & T. Berliner)

95-7 Sept. 14, 1995 Workshop. Recognized need for ecological health . Need specific changes in statements re: habitat. More explicit. (G. Bobker, D. Yaras, R. Weiner)

95-11 Sept. 14, 1995 Workshop. Concerned with available time to come up with a restoration Sept. 14, 1995 Workshop. Contrary to CALFED statements, we do understand yield and needs. Underlying inefficiencies are lack of system integration n plan- Wetland Goals project good model to follow. Urge to keep may statements in Problem statements. Little direct evidence. Encourage keeping restoring health of ecosystem; without Bay actions, not comprehensive Bay Delta Program (M. Johnson)

95-17 Exotics more of a problem than recognized - biomass has not been reduced (A. Hildebrand)

95-24 Habitat Restoration and Fishery Resources. Little evidence for relationship between new shallow water habitat and more fish-look to recovery plan for delta native fishes for

thoughts-should examine the evidence-use F&G or expert panel (F&G)

- 95-32 Categories of Actions for Bay-Delta Solutions. Take out reference to increasing instream flows possible impact on flooding-increases no done during high water time. Prime benefits to upstream rip. hab. to wildlife not fish; Increased Diversion Capacity category implies S. D. Project-a policy call, needs discussion. Rereg of flow could impact dstream; other comments re: Action Categories (1 page) (F&G)
- 95-36 Develop alts to address all other factors contributing to problems of fish decline in add. to inadequate habitat.-toxics, exotics, fishing impacts, etc.give equal attention, habitat restoration alone won't do it. Keep program schedule-momentum (R. Smith)
- 95-45 Bay-Delta Alternatives package. No recognition of economic benefits of anadromous fish or habitat. Fisheries should be explicit objective of ecosystem goals. Fish harvest Management sections deeply flawed-Friant not fishing that did in SJ spring run. Don't treat fishing as a problem-treat as objective. Hatchery needed for mitigation for projects. Fishermen have paid for mitigation of projects-recognize. Draft response attached to letter (N. Bingham)
- 95-48 Dec. 4 workshop - potential action categories & actions. Concerned that as habitat is built with increase n sp. will also be increase in "take"; in CALFED plan fishery agencies downplay "take" at pumps and recognize efforts to increase habitat (D. Okita)
- 96-1 Flows effects on Cont. shelf? Storm water management and more stringent conservation measures part of solution? (C. Broomhead)
- 96-3 Mission, geographic scope, draft problem summaries; do not adequately address los of naural functions. Accord, CVPIA = baseline (EW Caucus)
- 96-8 Survey response; level of detail not app. for BDAC. Emphasis favors natural restoration and management solutions over structural. Too early to make judgements on actions. Survey should not limit CALFED analysis
- 96-11 Problematic elements; ability to screen over 250cfs; jury out on acoustic barrier = \$ effective; expansion of hatchery program on SJR, counter to CVPIA doubling plan, 100KAFflush flow on SJ questionable, natural flushing is huge, may not be enough. Real time monitoring expensive - ned to determine merits. Mine drainage fundamental. Chain of lakes possible exotic introduction effects? Nov - Feb still concern for wr chinook and srn. No increase in use of Red Bluff Dam is intended, right? Likes core actions. (C. Mobly)